

Maciej Piegdoń

MARCUS LICINIUS CRASSUS
AND THE TRIAL OF PUBLIUS CLAUDIUS PULCHER

The issue of Marcus Licinius Crassus's participation in the events surrounding the trial of Clodius and the possible perpetration of bribery in favour of the latter has always been the subject of much controversy. Despite the suggestions made by some researchers one cannot exclude Crassus's participation in the bribing of the judges who returned a verdict in the Clodius trial. Most certainly one cannot assume that such an illustrious politician could afford to perpetrate the bribery personally. However, having great influence in various strata of society and political groups in the period of the Decline of the Roman Republic, he could easily have relied on other people to go through with this operation. It seems that, in addition to his money, this triumvir-to-be also used the influence he had as a patron of many young and ambitious people who intended to make a name for them in Rome's political arena. The author of this article has assumed that in the bribing of the judges Marcus Licinius Crassus used his connections with the *barbatuli iuvenes* group, as well as with a rather mysterious person hidden under the name of *Calvus ex Nanneianis*.

Calvus ex Nanneianis is mentioned in Marcus Tullius Cicero's letter to Titus Pomponius Atticus (of July 61). Due to the importance of the context it is well worth quoting the whole fragment relating to this person:

'Nosti Calvum ex Nanneianis illum, illum laudatorem meum, de cuius oratione erga me honorifica ad te scripseram. biduo per unum servum et eum ex ludo gladiatorio confecit totum negotium; arcessivit ad se, promisit, intercessit, dedit. iam vero (o di boni, rem perditam!) etiam noctes certarum mulierum atque adulescentulorum nobilium introductiones non nullis iudicibus pro mercede cumulo fuerunt. Ita summo dicessu bonorum, pleno foro servorum, XXV iudices ita fortes tamen fuerunt ut summo proposito periculo vel perire maluerint quam perdere omnia; XXXI fuerunt quos fames magis quam fama commoverit'.¹

¹ Cic., Att. 1.16.5: *You know Baldhead, him of the Nanneius sale(?), my encomiast, of whose complimentary speech I wrote to you. Inside a couple of days, with a single slave (an ex-gladiator at that) for*

This fragment has been analysed and interpreted many times. It has inspired a lot of controversy mainly because of the identity of the person mentioned in this text. So far, the historians dealing with the text have adopted two seemingly contradictory interpretations. The first of these interpretations, provided by P. Manuzius, is the oldest one as it goes back to XV c. This was the hypothesis that *Calvus ex Nanneianis* could be identified as Marcus Licinius Crassus – a man of great wealth, illustrious politician and later triumvir.² This hypothesis has also been supported by other contemporary researchers who, despite certain differences concerning the philological interpretation of the second element of the expression – ‘*ex Nanneianis*’, have no doubt that the whole fragment of the text is about Crassus.³ The other hypothesis treats the phrase *Calvus ex Nanneianis*, or at least its first element, as *cognomen* (nickname) of Caius Licinius Calvus, a famous orator, poet and politician, who was the son of Caius Licinius Macer,⁴ a renowned analyst and tribune of the people for the year 73.

The discussion below is neither a new attempt to interpret the above quotation nor a new contribution to the discussion about the identity of the mysterious *Calvus ex Nanneianis*. Because of the arguments provided by historians it seems that the hypothesis establishing a link between the phrase from Cicero's letter to Atticus and the *cognomen* of Caius Licinius Calvus, the one who bribed the judges during the Clodius trial, is the most convincing one. However, as mentioned earlier, one cannot exclude Marcus Licinius Crassus's participation in the act of bribery perpetrated by Calvus in the famous trial of Clodius. One can put forward the hypothesis that Crassus bribed the judges in favour of Clodius through this young man who was little known in the year 61 and who probably belonged to the group of young Roman aristocrats known as *barbatuli iuvenes* at that time quite active. There are sources which directly or indirectly show that Crassus and Calvus could have been connected with each other much earlier before the Clodius trial. The relationships between Crassus and Calvus might also mean that this Roman politician and a man of great wealth conducted his political activities by taking advantage of the connections which he had established as the patron of *iuventutis*.

To confirm the hypothesis that the judges were bribed by Crassus with the aid of Calvus, one has to analyse all available sources which mention connections between these two persons.

go-between, he settled the whole business-called them to his house, made promises, backed bills, or paid cash down. On top of that (it's really too abominable!) some jurors actually received a bonus in the form of assignations with certain ladies or introductions to youths of noble family. Yet even so, with the honest men making themselves very scarce and the Forum crowded with slaves, 25 jurors had the courage to take risk, no small one, preferring to sacrifice their lives rather than the whole community. To 31 on the other hand light purses mattered more than light reputations (translated by D.R. Shackelton Bailey). All dates mentioned in this article refer to the times before Christ (BC).

² Manuzius 1583: 27.

³ Marsh 1927: 31; Kumaniecki 1959: 237; Trenecsényi-Waldapfel 1964: 42–51; Cowell 1962: 140; Adcock 1966: 44; Rowland Jr. 1966: 220, note 16; Balsdon 1966: 72; Lintott 1967: 162; Iluk 1971: 8.

⁴ Frank 1919: 398; Hathorn 1954/1955: 33; Łoposzko 1972: 71–85; 1973: 127–138; 1974: 269–290; Wiseman 1968: 297; 1994: 363.

We know of only one source that directly links Crassus with Calvus. According to it, Crassus and Calvus together with Quintus Hortensius Hortalus, Cicero and Cnaeus Pompeius Magnus undertook the defence of Publius Sestius who was accused *de ambitu* and *de vi* in March 56. Sestius was accused by two little-known accusers: Marcus Tullius and Titus Claudius, who undoubtedly acted on Clodius's instigation. The accusation was an act of revenge because during his tribunate in the year 58 Sestius organised armed bands in support of the Senate which stood in opposition to *operae Clodianae*.⁵ However, it seems that Crassus and Calvus might have been acquainted with each other long before their defence of Sestius.

Most of all, one has to remember a fact which so far has not been thoroughly examined in considering the close connections between Calvus and Crassus in other words that Crassus was connected with Calvus's father, Caius Licinius Macer. The information about the collaboration between these two politicians can be found in the biography of Cicero written by Plutarch of Chaeronea, and it refers to earlier events in the first half of the 60's. Plutarch tells the reader that Licinius Macer was charged with embezzlement of public funds and corruption and put before the tribunal presided over by Cicero. Macer was found guilty despite the support provided by Marcus Licinius Crassus.⁶ The episode of Macer being accused *questio perpetue de repetundis* by the tribunal is also known from other sources according to which this accusation was connected with corrupt acts that Macer committed while holding the office of *pro praetore* in an unknown province.⁷ However, it is only Plutarch who mentions that Macer was supported by Crassus during the trial. Because this support was of little avail to him, he probably committed suicide⁸ after hearing the verdict given by the judges. It is hard to establish whether this was only a single example of cooperation or whether these politicians had collaborated with each other earlier. All the problems result from very poor source material referring to these two figures.⁹ However, it seems that the support given to Licinius Macer in 66 by Crassus is probably linked with his connections with the Populares in the 70's, and at the beginning of the 60's.

Crassus was one of the most influential politicians in Rome. He built his political status on the basis of various political and economic connections with every significant power in Rome. Crassus's political position is based on his huge fortune which was partly inherited from his father and partly acquired in rather dubious circumstances for example owing to Sulla's proscriptions. Other factors which enabled him to secure large clientele, gain influence upon the politics of the Republic and hold the highest offices in

⁵ Cic., *Quint.* 2.3; 2.4; *Schol. Cic. Bob.* Stangl.135. For speech *Pro Sestio*, see Kumaniecki 1959: 289–292; 1977: 251–252.

⁶ Plut., *Cic.* 9.

⁷ Cic., *Att.* 1.4.2; Val. Max. 9.12.7; Non. Marc.: 259 M. For jurisdiction in the period of the Republic, see Cloud 1994: 505–531.

⁸ According to Valerius Maximus' accounts Macer committed suicide, see Val. Max. 9.12.7, while according to Plutarch he died a natural death, see Plut., *Cic.* 9.

⁹ For Macer's activities as a tribune, see Sall., *Hist. fr.* 3.48.14–18; 21–24; Cic., *Rab.* 2; Rogosz 1992: 54–71.

the Roman *cursus honorum* are as follows: the clever manoeuvring between numerous *factiones* in the Senate which were usually set at variance, unclear financial links with the equestrians and publicans, the undertaking of the defence of various people in all possible trials as well as his affinities with the most influential families of the Roman *nobilitas* – the Caecilii Metellii and the Cornelii Lentulii.¹⁰

Undoubtedly, he also had contacts with the *Populares* who were regaining their political influence in the 70's. Various sources provide information on certain political connections between Crassus and the *Populares* in the Sullan era but the nature of these links remains obscure. Not much can be said about Crassus's connections with C. Sicinius, tribune of the people for the year 76. The tribune made himself famous for his vehement attacks on the system of government created by Sulla and on the Sullans ruling after the year 78, e.g. two consuls from the year 76 – Caius Scribonius Curio and Caius Octavius. Curiously enough, in his tirades Sicinius did not mention Crassus and did not even attempt to speak against him.¹¹ Some ancient authors also claimed that the subsequent tribune of the people for the year 75, Lucius Quinctius, served as a legate in Crassus's army during his military activities aimed at crushing the Spartacus slave revolt.¹² One should also keep in mind that due to the support received in 71 from Pompey and the *Populares*, in the year 70 he managed to take hold of the office of consul together with Pompey. The raising of Pompey and Crassus to the consulship in the year 70 led to the repeal of the Sullan laws limiting the rights of tribunes of the people by the terms of *lex Pompeia Licinia de tribunicia potestate*, of which they were co-authors.¹³ Crassus was not the only Sullan ruler who began to collaborate with the *Populares*. Three other people who commenced such collaboration are as follows: Marcus Aemilius Lepidus, consul for the year 78 who declared a military action against the Senate, and Caius Aurelius Cotta, consul for the year 75 whose bill *lex Aurelia de tribunicia potestate* brought back the possibility of senatorial offices being held by former tribunes of the people and Pompey.¹⁴ At the beginning of the 60's Crassus also supported political initiatives of the *Populares*. In December 67 he supposedly supported the proposal made by tribune Caius

¹⁰ Cic., *Off.* 1.25: *M. Crassus negabat ullam satis magnam pecuniam esse ei, qui in re publica princeps vellet esse, cuius fructibus exercitum alere non posset*; Plut., *Crass.* 7; 35 (2); Dio 37.56. For collaboration between Crassus and the equites, see Rogosz 2000: 66–68. The wives of Crassus's elder son, Marcus, and younger son, Publius, were Caecilia Metella and Cornelia respectively, see Münzer 1927a: 247–248.

¹¹ Plut., *Crass.* 7. Plutarch tells the reader that G. Sicinius, tribune for the year 76, when asked why he did not attack Crassus, probably answered that Crassus 'had hay on his horn' which meant either that he was a very influential and dangerous person, not worth being attacked, or that Sicinius was somehow connected with Crassus.

¹² Liv., *Per.*, 96; Plut., *Crass.* 11.

¹³ For *lex Pompeia Licinia*, see Cic., *Verr.* 1.15; *Div. in Caec.* 3; Sall., *Cat.* 38.1; Caes., *Bell. Civ.* 1.7; Vell. Pat., 2.30; App., *Bell. Civ.*, 13, 121; Suet., *Iul.* 5; Plut., *Pomp.* 22; Dio 36.38; Stockton 1964: 210–212; Rogosz 1992: 102–103.

¹⁴ For collaboration between Lepidus and the *populares*, see Sall., *Hist. fr.* 1.77 Maur.; App., *Bell. Civ.*, 13, 107; Plut., *Pomp.* 16; Rogosz 1988: 101–111; 1992: 16–23. For role played by G. Aurelius Cotta, see Cic., *Corn.* 1, fr. 51; Rogosz 1992: 36–38. For collaboration between Pompey and the *populares*, see Sall., *Hist.* 3, fr. 48; Cic., *Verr.* 2.2; App., *Bell. Civ.*, 13, 105; Plut., *Pomp.* 15.

Manilius, according to which freedmen were allowed to be registered in all thirty five *tribus* and vote together with those who had freed them.¹⁵ As a result of this, it is quite possible that the above-mentioned connections between Licinius Macer and Crassus were not only limited to the support that the former consul gave the former tribune of the people during the *de repetundis* trial in the year 66, but were an element of Crassus's policies conducted consciously in relation to the *Populares*, which was a significant political party.

There is one more seemingly unessential issue which can nevertheless shed some light on the relations between these politicians. Sources tell us that one of Crassus's many interests was history. Unfortunately, all that we can say about his hobby is that he was 'expert in history'.¹⁶ It is Caius Licinius Macer who was a historian and the author of the then famous *Annales*. Contemporary researchers include him among the so-called younger annalists.¹⁷ Obviously, this joint interest in history does not necessarily mean that there were close connections between them. On the other hand, however, Livius, who used the lost work by Macer, tells the reader that in his *Annales* Caius Licinius Macer laid emphasis on his own family i.e. the *Licinii*¹⁸ with *Licinii Crassi* being one of its offshoots. It was the prestige of his family, in addition to its wealth, that Crassus particularly emphasised while aiming at becoming the supreme politician in Rome – *principatus*.¹⁹

Consequently, the connections between Caius Licinius Macer and Marcus Licinius Crassus might have influenced the life of Caius Licinius Calvus who, as has already been mentioned, was the son of a well-known tribune and annalist. At the moment of his father's death in 66 Calvus was probably sixteen years old and despite being a very young man, according to the law he was no longer *pupillus*, i.e. an orphan.²⁰ Although there is no evidence, it is possible that after Licinius Macer's decease Crassus could take young Calvus under his protection. Perhaps even before Macer's death Calvus arrived at this powerful and wealthy noble's house which could have functioned as one of numerous centres of patronage in the republican Rome. In such a place Calvus could have broadened the knowledge acquired under the supervision of his father and developed

¹⁵ Cic., *Mur.* 23; Dion 36.42. For significance of colleges to Crassus, see Iluk 1971: 20–21. For role of colleges in the republican Rome, see Linderski 1961: *passim*.

¹⁶ Plut., *Crass.* 3.

¹⁷ For Caius Licinius Macer, a historian and the author of *Annales*, see Cic., *leg.* 1.2.7; Non. Marc., 1: 63 M.; Prisc., *gramm.* 2.243.2. The name of *Historiae* used as the title of Macer's work is incorrectly given by Macr., *Sat.* 1.10.7. Macer's work was used by Livius and Dionysius of Halicarnassus. See also Münzer 1927b: 424–426; Kumaniecki 1977: 112–114.

¹⁸ Liv., 4.9.3–6.

¹⁹ Dion 37.56. Crassus's attempts aiming at the primacy in Rome are also emphasised by Cic., *Off.* 1.25; Plut., *Crass.* 14; Vell. Pat., 2.44; Flor., 2.13.

²⁰ For Calvus's date of birth, see Plin., *NH*, 7.165: *C. Mario Cn. Carbone III cos. A. D. V Kal. Iunias M. Caelius Rufus et C. Licinius Calvus eodem die geniti sunt, oratores quidem ambo sed tamen dispari eventu* that is 28th day of May of the year 82. Of a different opinion is Mnzer 1927: 429. According to the Roman law, a *Pupillus*, i.e. an orphan who was subject to legal protection, could be a person of up to fourteen years of age, Cf. Dig., 50.1.

the great oratorical skills of which Cicero made mention.²¹ Crassus himself was a well-educated man with many interests. His father, Publius Licinius Crassus, consul for the year 97, made him sensitive to the issues of education and culture. Because he was also a distinguished orator, it is possible that Calvus stayed in his house.²² In addition to his well-documented financial and political activities Crassus was also famous for being a patron of young, talented people who were not always descended from the circles of *nobilitas*. He was the patron of a philosopher-peripatetic named Alexander, among others. He also had a large group of well-educated slaves and freedmen, who not only helped him run his huge estates but possibly also to educate his sons, Publius and Marcus Crassii,²³ as well. Besides these two sons, in Crassus's house there lived a great future orator, Marcus Caelius Rufus, who was contemporary of Calvus and the son of an equestrian knight.²⁴ The triumvir's sons were skillful and talented in many areas. Publius had military abilities which he demonstrated during his service in Roman Gaul under the command of Caius Julius Caesar and under the command of his father during his campaign against the Parthians. He was also a distinguished orator and a man of considerable knowledge.²⁵ Crassus not only attached importance to the upbringing and education of his own sons as well as the sons of his friends and *clientes* that were brought up in his house, but he also provided opportunities for developing oratorical skills by promoting contacts with other renowned orators. Publius Licinius Crassus and his client's son, Marcus Caelius Rufus, were influenced by the skills of the great orator Marcus Tullius Cicero with whom both Publius and Caelius Rufus had relations.²⁶

It seems that being a patron was an important part of Marcus Crassus's political activities: these aimed at the establishment of the broadest possible network of mutual relationships based on *amicitia* and the increase of his influence upon events in Rome through loyal *clientes*. It is obvious that wealthy and influential nobles did not support little-known but talented young people disinterestedly. A patron usually expected gratitude (*gratia*) in the form of support for his proposals in the Senate, at assemblies and any kind of *contiones*, the support in election campaigns (often by means of buying over the

²¹ For Caius Licinius Macer as an orator and Calvus's father, see Cic., *Brut.* 67; Prisc., *gramm.* 10.532 H.

²² Plut., *Crass.* 3. For his interests and the upbringing in the house of Crassus's father, see Strab. 3.106; Plut., *Crass.* 1. Cicero's opinion on Marcus Licinius Crassus depended on their mutual relations. He extols Marcus Licinius Crassus as an orator during their defence of Murena Cic., *Mur.* 23, Balbus, see Cic., *Balb.* 7; 22 and Caelius Rufus, see Cic., *Coel.* 10 and Cic., *Att.* 1.14.4. Cicero's attitude to Crassus's skills is completely different after Crassus's death, see Cic., *Brut.* 66. One should also pay attention to Tacitus' opinion on Crassus's oratorical skills, see Tac., *dial.* 37: '*Ex his intellegi potest Cn. Pompeium et M. Crassum non viribus modo et armis, sed ingenio quoque et oratione valuisse*' and Vell. Pat., 2.36.

²³ Cic., *Brut.* 81; Plut., *Crass.* 2; 3.

²⁴ Cic., *Coel.* 2; 4; Tac., *dial.* 21.

²⁵ For Publius as a commander, see Caes. *Bell. Gall.*, III, 20–27; Plut., *Crass.* 25–26; Cic. 36; Dio 40.21. For Publius as an orator, see Cic., *Brut.* 81.

²⁶ Tac., *dial.* 34. For Publius Crassus, see Cic., *Quint.* 2.9; *Fam.* 5.8; *Pis.* 14, *Brut.* 81; Plut., *Cic.* 30; *Crass.* 13; Dion 38.17. For Marcus Caelius Rufus, see Cic., *Coel.* 4; *Brut.* 79; *Quint., inst.* 10.1; Tac., *dial.* 17; 18; 21; 25; 26; 38. For cultural role of *nobilitas*, see Aleksandrowicz 1996: *passim*; 1999: 11–20; 2002: *passim*.

undecided) and the undertaking of the defence of all his associates in any actions brought against them before tribunals by his political opponents. A patron also helped take over an office or assume authority in a province in exchange for influence and money. Moreover, being a patron conferred a lot of prestige on nobles.

It is difficult to say when Crassus began to employ the fruits of these activities in his political career. Without a doubt, he started to collaborate with young aristocrats as early as in the middle of the 60's when he was already a meritorious and influential politician – he had already been a victor over Spartacus, consul for the year 70 and censor for the year 65. One of the examples of such collaboration is the activity of Cnaeus Calpurnius Piso, the governor of Spain in the year 65, who was supposed to carry Crassus's policies into effect.²⁷ Another example might be certain activities performed by young Caius Julius Caesar in the 60's who helped Crassus with some of his enterprises from that period: he attempted to subjugate Egypt in 65, to support the draft agrarian laws of Publius Servilius Rullus in 64 and to support two candidates standing for consulship for the year 63, namely Lucius Sergius Catilina and Caius Antonius Hybrida.²⁸ He probably got on well with young aristocrats who joined the Catilinarian conspiracy. This is, at any rate, the case with Marcus Caelius Rufus, who was Crassus's and Cicero's ward, and who joined the Catilinarian conspiracy for some time.²⁹ It may reasonably be supposed that in the second half of the 60's and in the 50's Crassus could count on the support of young aristocrats for whom he had acted as a patron and who were just beginning their political careers.

It was at the turn of the 60's that one can begin to discern a pattern of activity on the part of young men in their twenties who were often termed in Cicero's speeches and letters as *barbatuli iuvenes*.³⁰ Such activity was the result of the relative stability of the political system and the fact that the future of the Republic was threatened during the Catilinarian conspiracy. Cicero's *Concordia ordinum* – the concord between all social classes – broke up because of the conflicts within the Senate itself. The end of the 60's also saw increasing tension between *piscinarii*, a conservative wing of the Senate, and three very influential, ambitious and popular men – Pompey, Crassus and Caesar. What is more, at that time the Senate and equites were in conflict as well.³¹ The tension was directly caused by the profanation of the mysteries of Bona Dea (in which only women could participate) by Publius Claudius Pulcher (also known as Clodius) in December 62 and his subsequent trial by the Optimates who were evidently prejudiced against him.

²⁷ Sall., *Cat.* 19. Suetonius, however, considers Caesar to be instigator of Piso's initiative, Suet., *Iul.* 9.

²⁸ Cic., *Leg. Agr.* 1.1–2: *architecti huiusque legis*; 2.16–17: *hac lege agraria... condonari certis hominibus omnia*; Cic., *Reg. Alex.* fr. 6: *Sic est iusta causa, sicuti Crassus commemoravit cum lugurtha fuisse*, Plut., *Crass.* 13; Cic. 12 and Ward 1973: 244–258.

²⁹ Cic., *Coel.* 4–7. In the light of the existing sources Crassus's role in the events from the time of the conspiracy is obscure, see Marsh 1963: 168; Yavetz 1963: 486; Łoposzko 1987: 295; 1994: 259.

³⁰ Cic., *Att.* 1.14.5; 1.15.1; 2.7.3. For activities of *barbatuli iuvenes*, see also Allen 1937: 317, who, nevertheless, emphasises Cicero's great influence on young aristocrats.

³¹ Cic., *Att.* 1.17.8; 1.18.3; 1.20.3; 2.1.7; Macr. *Sat.* 3.15; Syme 1939: 23. This conflict is emphasised by Rogosz 2000: 61–66.

The conflict between Clodius and the Optimates was particularly noticeable at the stage of determining which tribunal should pass judgement in Clodius's case. Both parties in this conflict mobilised all their supporters. Moreover, they also made use of every possible legal and religious procedure could be directed against their antagonists.³² During the trial Clodius was supported by the *barbatuli iuvenes* who were led by Caius Scribonius Curio, sometimes called *princeps iuventutis*. Curio and his *barbatuli iuvenes* laid great stress on their discontent over the prosecution of Clodius and they brought pressure to bear on the Senate, the Assembly and later on the tribunal judging the case to set Clodius³³ free. This was the first recorded action carried out by young aristocrats who, in the first half of the 50's during the first triumvirate of Pompey, Crassus and Caesar, became the Opposition aiming at primacy in the state of Pompey and Caesar. Contemporary researchers use the term *barbatuli iuvenes* to refer to a large circle of the sons of meritorious nobles. For example, besides the earlier-mentioned Curio, who was the son of Caius Scribonius Curio (consul 76), they also mention three other people belonging to *barbatuli iuvenes*, namely a triumvir-to-be, Marcus Antonius, Decimus Brutus Albinus and little-known Megabocchus.³⁴

It seems that this group was much larger and could, apart from the above-mentioned people, include Marcus Caelius Rufus, one of Crassus's sons – Publius, and Caius Licinius Calvus who probably was another ward of Crassus. Calvus's membership of the *barbatuli iuvenes* is probable due to Cicero's use of the term *ex Nanneianis* in describing him. *Ex Nanneianis* is the equivalent of either the Greek word 'νένοϋς' which means someone small, tiny, or the Greek word 'νεανίαί' meaning youth.³⁵

Clodius could have taken into account other nobles as well. It is worth mentioning here that he had the support some senators including Caius Scribonius Curio (consul 76 and the father of the *princeps iuventutis*), fifteen other senators not known by their names, consul Marcus Pupius Piso Calpurnius Frugi, the tribune of the people Quintus Fufius Calenus and possibly *clientes* of the powerful Claudius family.³⁶ One should also lay emphasis on the fact that the 'main victim' – Caesar, did not testify against Clodius before the tribunal.³⁷ So one cannot exclude support for Clodius on the part of Crassus

³² Cic., *Att.* 1.12.2; 1.13.3; 1.16.1–5; Suet., *Jul.* 6; App., *Bell. Civ.*, XIV, 14; Plut., *Caes.* 9–10; Cic. 28; Dion 37.45. See also Kumaniecki 1959: 231–237; Balsdon 1966: *passim*. For religious aspects of Clodius's case, see Kowalski 1992: 67–75; 1995: 36–37.

³³ Cic., *Vat.* 24; *Att.* 1.14.5; 1.16.1. He was also called *homo ingeniosissime* – 'a brilliant do-for-nothing', see Vell. Pat., 2.48.

³⁴ For Curio, see Rowland 1966: *passim*; Iluk 1971: 11–17. For Marcus Antonius, see Rowland Jr. 1966: 221; Łoposzko 1974: 86. For Decimus Brutus Albinus, see Wiseman 1968: 299. For Megabocchus, see Cic., *Att.* 2.7.3; Plut., *Crass.* 25; Iluk 1971: 11–13.

³⁵ The first translation of the expression *ex Nanneianis* was accepted by Frank 1919: 398, while, the second one was put forward by Wiseman 1968: 299. One should not forget, however, that this expression can refer to something Calvus was famous for, namely his short stature, Cf. Catull. 53; Sen., *contr.* 7.4.7. Cicero uses the term 'οἱ νεώτεροι' (the young ones) to talk about neoteric poets, with Calvus reckoned among them, see Cic., *Att.* 7.2.1.

³⁶ Cic., *Att.* 1.14. Because of the kind of political activities conducted by Crassus it is improbable that he would be one of the fifteen senators who openly supported Clodius.

³⁷ App., *Bell. Civ.*, 14, 14; Suet., *Jul.* 74; Plut., *Caes.* 10; Cic. 29; Dion 37.46; 38.11.

who tried to maintain the best possible relationships with the Optimates because of the presence of his antagonist Pompey³⁸ who had come from the East. Nevertheless, Crassus, being a flexible and experienced politician often changing sides, could have covertly supported the future tribune of the people without estranging himself from the Senate. He tried not to lose popular support but at the same time not to antagonize the powerful family of the Claudian gens. Pompey's attitude could also have been important for Crassus. Pompey, too, had the support on the part of the *populus*, and despite the fact that he decidedly did not support any of the parties, he seemed to be more on the side of the Senate since he wanted his decrees in the East to be ratified and land for his veterans to be secured.³⁹

The transfer of money for the bribing of the judges through Calvus was for Crassus an element of his political strategy. Most of the money for the trial and the activities preceding it was provided by Clodius himself, which is clearly emphasised in various sources.⁴⁰ However, taking into consideration the length and range of the whole operation and the opponents's potency of this future tribune, it could have turned out that Clodius's financial resources were insufficient. What needs to be mentioned here is a fragment of Cicero's letter to Atticus. In this fragment Cicero makes mention of a draft law submitted by a tribune of the people named Marcus Aufidius Lurco. This law stipulated that all those who perpetrated the bribery of electoral *tribus* would be fined but those who promised bribes but did not actually give them would be acquitted. By mentioning this draft law Cicero ironically reproached his adversary with the fact that in the same way he used to promise money but did not give it.⁴¹ This does not attest too well to Clodius's financial credibility and may show that a third party could have been involved in the bribing of the judges.

Undoubtedly, such an opportunity was utilised by Crassus who, wanting to win a new ally, could have supported Clodius financially through Calvus even to a minimal degree. On the other hand, however, in the years that followed it is difficult to find any evidence of gratitude on the part of Clodius.⁴² There was nothing exceptional in this

³⁸ He supported Lucius Licinius Lucullus, Pompey's predecessor, in the war against Mithradates VI Eupator, see Plut., *Lucull.* 42; *Pomp.* 46; *Cat. Min.* 31; Keavney 1998: 153–155.

³⁹ Cic., *Att.* 1.14.2–4; 1.16.11–12; 1.18.6–8; 1.20.5; Plut., *Pomp.* 46; *Lucull.* 42; *Cat. Min.* 30; Dio 37.49.

⁴⁰ Cic., *Att.* 1.16.3–6; 10; *Harusp.* 37; *Schol. Bob.: In Clodium et Curionem* Stangl.: 86; *De aere alieno* Milonis Stangl.: 173; Quint., *inst.* 8.3; Łoposzko 1972: 75–82; 1973: 132–136.

⁴¹ Cic., *Att.* 1.16.13. Beside this draft law of *de ambitu*, the Senate also allowed even the houses of officials to be searched and it declared enemies those in whose houses were people distributing money. For Lurco, see Cic., *Flacc.* 86; Hor., *sat.* 2.4.24; Plin. *N.H.* X, 45.

⁴² This is emphasised by Łoposzko 1972: 75–82, 1973: 138–150. On the other hand, however, Clodius's certain activities during his tribunate in the year 58 may attest to his collaboration with Crassus in his contest with Pompey and Caesar in the 50's, see Marsh 1927: 31; Rowland Jr. 1966: passim; Iluk 1971: 19–21, who thinks that Clodius's bill about the reintroduction of colleges was the result of the collaboration between Clodius and Crassus. It was only in the year 56 that one could clearly notice Clodius's support for Crassus in his attempts to bring Ptolemy XII Auletes back to the Egyptian throne, see Cic., *Quint.* 2.3; Plut., *Pomp.* 48; Dion 39.19.

since much earlier Crassus had been suspected of bribing electoral *tribus* in favour of Caius Antonius and Catilina who were competing for the consulship for the year 63.⁴³ Later he also used similar methods, for example, he provided financial support for Caius Julius Caesar who found himself in serious troubles before his departure to Hispania Ulterior in 61 to take the office of *pro praetore*. His creditors did not want to let him leave Rome until his financial obligations were discharged. At that time Crassus provided the amount of 830 talents for the payment of Caesar's debts. Nevertheless, one cannot undoubtedly confirm that Caesar was directly under an obligation to Crassus. The bribing of the judges in favour of Clodius is similarly difficult to ascertain.⁴⁴

Caius Licinius Calvus was the most appropriate person for this kind of operation.⁴⁵ He became a great orator (following Atticus' style), lawyer and neoteric poet⁴⁶ (one of the most important beside Catullus). In 61, however, Calvus was a little-known budding politician. Apart from bribing the judges, mainly, according to sources, equites and *tribuni aerarii*, Calvus also organised other entertainment: '*Iam vero (o di boni, rem perditam!) etiam noctes certarum mulierum atque adolescentulorum nobilium introductiones non nullis iudicibus pro mercede cumulo fuerunt*'.⁴⁷ The methods and means used in the bribery as well as the atmosphere of scandal accompanying this event can only confirm that Calvus was one of the *barbatuli iuvenes* who participated in this operation. Both in his speeches and letters, particularly in *Pro M. Caelio oratio*, Marcus Cicero frequently complained of the demoralisation of aristocratic youth in the republican Rome and he quite accurately portrays the behaviour of young Romans, which is also confirmed by other ancient writers.⁴⁸

The participation of *barbatuli iuvenes* in the events connected with the trial of Clodius in 61 was not a single action. It was a prelude to their subsequent activities directed against the so-called first triumvirate when *amicitia* between Pompey, Crassus and Cae-

⁴³ Asc. 82–83 C.

⁴⁴ Suet., *Iul.* 18; App., *Bell. Civ.* 14, 8; Plut., *Caes.* 11.

⁴⁵ It results from the beginning of the sentence '*Nosti Calvum...*', which can be either a conditional or interrogative sentence, see Łoposzko 1972: 83; 1973: 137–138.

⁴⁶ For Caius Licinius Calvus and his oratorical skills and his works (which comprised 21 speeches, including the three most famous ones against Publius Vatinius) and his style, see Cic., *Fam.* 15.21; *Brut.* 82; Quint., *inst.* 10.1; Tac., *dial.* 18; 21; 25; 34; Sen., *contr.* 7.4; Catull. 53; Kumaniecki 1977: 169–172; Aleksandrowicz 1996: 74–75. For Calvus's poetry and his friendship with Catullus, see Catull. 14; 53; 96; Hor., *sat.* 1.10; Ovid., *am.* 3.9.62; *trist.* 2.427; 431; Verg., *ecl.* 6.47; 52; Plin. Min., *epist.* 1.16; Gel., 19, 9; Diom., *gramm.* 1.376; Kumaniecki 1977: 63–64. For Catullus and the circle of neoterics, see Wiseman 1987: *passim*. Catullus' legal knowledge was much appreciated by Cicero who often consulted him about many issues relating to property, see Cic., *Quint.* 3.1.

⁴⁷ *On top of that (it's really too abominable!) some jurors actually received a bonus in the form of assignations with certain ladies or introductions to youths of noble family* (translated by D.R. Shackelton Bailey). The Senate tried to pass a law which would allow for an inquiry into the case of bribed judges–equites, thus extending the Sullan law which so far had been applied against the judges–senators. This was strongly opposed by Cicero, who, despite his disapproval of the bribery, realised that such inquiry might ruin his *concordia ordinum* created during his consulship, see Cic., *Att.* 1.17.8.

⁴⁸ Cic., *Cael.*, *passim*; Sall., *Cat.* 12. The methods and means used by Calvus in the bribing of the judges correspond with the description of the behaviour of young aristocrats found in the speech made for Caelius.

sar was being created and shaped. The three men managed to gain control of Rome in the first months of the year 59. However, because of disagreement between the triumvirs themselves and the discontent with the new order expressed by many groups within the *nobilitas*, the speeches made by *iuventutis* became more vehement.⁴⁹ Of course, the attacks made on the order established after the year 60 could have been and probably were instigated by the Senate, although one cannot exclude the fact that the triumvirs who were vying with each other, especially Caesar and Crassus, used the discontented aristocratic youth in the rivalry between themselves.⁵⁰ Due to the above-mentioned source evidence it seems that some of these actions taken against Pompey and Caesar were instigated by Crassus whose relations with *barbatuli iuvenes* have been demonstrated. One such example of the instigation of the *barbatuli iuvenes* and Clodius's actions by Crassus is the event of the year 56 when they collaborated in order to appoint a leader who would bring Ptolemy XII Auletes (who had been removed from Egypt) to the Egyptian throne. Pompey accused Clodius, Caius Porcius Cato and Caius Scribonius Curio of attacking him at the instigation of Crassus. He also accused the members of the Optimates – Marcus Calpurnius Bibulus, Publius Servilius Vatia and Marcus Favonius of supporting his opponents in the activities aimed at taking the command of the expedition to Egypt.⁵¹ These facts show that until his expedition to the East Crassus conducted his policies based on the influence on the part of the *barbatuli iuvenes* which he had gained as a patron.

Caius Licinius Calvus, too, is seen in the political events of the 50's that were related to the activities of the triumvirs and Crassus himself. His attitude towards *amicitia*, just like the attitude of many other *barbatuli iuvenes*, was equivocal. An example of such equivocal behaviour is, on the one hand, his collaboration with Crassus during their defence of Publius Sestius in March 56, and on the other hand, his attacks on the hateful Publius Vatinius, tribune for the year 59 and Caesar's supporter whom he prosecuted three times. So it is hard to say whether Calvus was hostile to the whole *amicitia* between Pompey, Crassus and Caesar or whether his speeches attested to his hostility only towards some of its participants and their supporters. An example of such an attitude can be found in the vehement attacks on Caesar's supporter, Vatinius.⁵² On the

⁴⁹ Cic. *Att.* 2.7.3; 2.9; 2.13; 2.14; 2.18; 2.19; *Quint.* 1.2; Suet., *Iul.* 50.

⁵⁰ For instigation of *barbatuli iuvenes*' actions by Caesar, see Carcopino 1968: 730. However, it is Crassus who is considered to be the instigator of aristocratic youth's activities by Rowland Jr. 1966: passim; Iluk 1971: 11–15. It seems that these researchers, who assume the collaboration between young aristocrats and Crassus, are right. One should only analyse the sources which mention *iuventutis*' hostility to Pompey and Caesar, see Cic., *Att.* 2.7 (against Pompey); 2.9 (Curio against Caesar); 2.19 (Curio against Caesar and Pompey), 2.24 (the Vetius case); *Quint.* 1.12 (G. Porcius Cato against Pompey); Suet., *Iul.* 50 (Curio against Caesar); *Iul.* 73 (Calvus and Catullus against Caesar). However, nothing is known about young aristocrats' personal attacks on Crassus.

⁵¹ Cic., *Fam.* 1.1; 1.2; 1.4; *Quint.* 2.2; Gruen 1974: 62–120. One should keep in mind the fact that since at least the year 60 Pompey, Crassus and Caesar had been united by *amicitia*, the so-called the first triumvirate. Pompey's accusations as well as the earlier events attest to a nearly complete break-up of this agreement which was rebuilt in the year 56 after the congress in Ravenna and Lucca.

⁵² It seems that Calvus's hostile speeches were directed against Caesar, with whom he finally became reconciled (See Suet., *Iul.* 73), and his supporter, Vatinius (See Cic., *Quint.* 2.4; *Vat.* 33, 34, 37; *Sest.* 135;

other hand, however, one should keep in mind that in 54 he undertook the defence of Caius Porcius Cato, tribune for the year 56, who was accused by the Optimates including Caius Asinius Pollio. Caius Porcius Cato did the triumvirs a favour by blocking the election of officials for the year 55 and leading to the *interregnum* in 55 during which Pompey and Crassus were elected consuls. Moreover, as already mentioned, he was also Crassus's supporter in his attempts to take the command of the expedition to Egypt in 56.⁵³

It seems then that one cannot entirely exclude Marcus Licinius Crassus's participation in the bribery perpetrated by *Calvus ex Nanneianis* (undoubtedly Caius Licinius Calvus) in favour of Publius Claudius Pulcher in the trial of 61. Most importantly, the evidence of the collaboration between Crassus and Calvus in the preparation of the bribery can be shown by links between Crassus and Calvus's father, Caius Licinius Macer, which go back to at least the first half of the 60's. It is very improbable that Caius Licinius Calvus, a little-known young man who lost his father at a very young age, could afford to provide money for the bribery. This could be afforded either by Clodius himself or a person (or people) that supported him and treated this action as an element of the contest with the Senate. They probably wanted to take part in this contest but not necessarily in an overt way. Marcus Licinius Crassus might have been such a person. Firstly, he was connected with Calvus who perpetrated the bribery and, secondly, he considered the conflict between the Senate and Clodius's supporters to be a great opportunity for gaining his political ends. In this contest he used not only his great wealth but also his patronage for some of *iuventutis*, not his own sons alone, but also other young people, including the sons of their *clientes*, e.g. Marcus Caelius Rufus or possibly Caius Licinius Calvus.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adcock, F.E. (1966): *Marcus Crassus Millionaire*. Cambridge.
- Aleksandrowicz, T. (1996): *Elita władzy a oratorstwo w schyłkowym okresie Rzeczypospolitej Rzymskiej*. Katowice.
- Aleksandrowicz, T. (1999): Polityczna i kulturalna rola „nobilitas” w schyłkowym okresie Republiki Rzymskiej, in A. Kunisz (ed.), *Rzym antyczny. Polityka i pieniądz*. Katowice: 11–20.
- Aleksandrowicz, T. (2002): *Kultura intelektualna rzymskich konsulów w schyłkowym okresie Republiki*. Katowice.
- Allen, W. (1937): The Importance of Young Men in Ciceronian Politics, *CJ* 32: 317–336.

Catull. 53; Tac., *dial.* 21; 34). Some other fragments of his works are also directed against Pompey, see *Fragmenta Poetarum Latinorum et lyricorum praeter Ennium et Lucilium* (FPL), ed. W. Morel, Leipzig 1927, fr. 17 & 18 M., p. 84–87. Nothing can be found in sources about similar attacks made by Calvus on Marcus Licinius Crassus.

⁵³ Cic., *Att.* 4.15.1; Sen., *contr.* 7.4.7. For activities of Caius Porcius Cato, see Linderski 1966: 92–94, 139.

- Balsdon, J.P.V.D. (1966): *Fabula Clodiana*, *Historia* 15: 63–73.
- Carcopino, J. (1968): *Jules César*. Paris.
- Cloud, D. (1994): The Constitution and Public Criminal Law, *CAH²*, vol. IX: 505–531.
- Cowell, F.R. (1962): *The Revolutions of Ancient Rome*. London.
- Frank, T. (1919): Cicero and the Poetae Novi, *AJPh* 40: 397–413.
- Gruen, E. (1974): *The Last Generation of the Roman Republic*. Berkley–Los Angeles–London.
- Hathorn, R.Y. (1954/55): Calvum ex Nanneianis, *CJ* 50: 33–40.
- Iluk, J. (1971): Kilka uwag o roli M. Licyniusza Krassusa w I triumwiracie, *Zeszyty Naukowe Uniwersytetu Gdanskiego*, sectio H. Gdańsk: 5–23.
- Keavney, A. (1998): *Lukullus*. Warszawa.
- Kowalski, H. (1992): Publiusz Klodiusz a religia rzymska w I w.p.n.e., *Acta Universitatis Nicolai Copernici*, *Historia* 27. Toruń: 67–75.
- Kowalski, H. (1995): Rola polityczna kapłanów w Rzymie w okresie schyłku Republiki, in A. Kunisz (ed.), *W 2500 – lecie powstania Republiki Rzymskiej*. Katowice: 31–51.
- Kumaniecki, K. (1959): *Cycon i jego współcześni*. Warszawa.
- Kumaniecki, K. (1977): *Literatura rzymska. Okres cyconowski*. Warszawa.
- Linderski, J. (1961): *Państwo a kolegia. Ze studiów nad historią rzymskich stowarzyszeń u schyłku Republiki*. Kraków.
- Linderski, J. (1966): *Rzymskie zgromadzenia wyborcze od Sulli do Cezara*. Kraków.
- Lintott, W. (1967): Clodius Pulcher – felix Catilina?, *G&R* 14: 157–168.
- Łoposzko, T. (1972): Kto kryje się pod określeniem Cycon „Calvus ex Nanneianis”?, *Eos* 60: 71–85.
- Łoposzko, T. (1973): Tajne intrzygi Marka Krassusa w latach 61–56 p.n.e., *Annales Universitatis Mariae Curie-Skłodowska*, sectio F, vol. XXVIII. Lublin: 127–138.
- Łoposzko, T. (1974): *Trybunat Puliusza Klodiusza w świetle źródeł i historiografii*. Warszawa.
- Łoposzko, T. (1987): *Historia społeczna republikańskiego Rzymu*. Warszawa.
- Łoposzko, T. (1994): Problemy społeczne schyłkowej Republiki, in J. Wolski, T. Kotula, A. Kunisz (eds), *Starożytny Rzym we współczesnych badaniach. Państwo – Społeczeństwo – Gospodarka. Liber in memoriam Lodovici Piotrowicz*. Kraków: 235–279.
- Manuzius, P. (1583): *In epistolas M. Tulli Ciceronis ad T. Pomponium Atticum, M. Iunium Brutum et Quintum fratrem Pauli Manutii Commentaris*. Venetis.
- Marsh, F.B. (1927): The Policy of Clodius from 58–56 B.C., *CQ* 21: 30–36.
- Marsh, F.B. (1963): *A History of the Roman World 146 – 30 B.C.* London.
- Münzer, F. (1927a): *Licinii Crassi*, *RE* XIII: 245–250.
- Münzer, F. (1927b): *Licinius Macer Calvus*, *RE* XIII: 428–435.
- Rogosz, N. (1988): Kwestia restytucji znaczenia trybunatu ludowego w programie politycznym Marka Emiliusza Lepidusa (78–77 r.p.n.e.), in A. Kunisz (ed.), *Studia z dziejów starożytnego Rzymu*. Katowice: 101–111.
- Rogosz, N. (1992): *Polityczna rola trybunatu ludowego w Rzymie w latach restauracji sullauskiej (78–70)*. Katowice.
- Rogosz, N. (2000): Rzymskie grupy społeczne a przemiany polityczne w Republice na przełomie lat sześćdziesiątych i pięćdziesiątych I wieku przed Chr., *Electrum* 4: 59–71.
- Rowland Jr., R.J. (1966): Crassus, Clodius and Curio in the Year 59 B.C., *Historia* 15: 217–223.
- Stockton, D. (1964): The First Consulship of Pompey, *Historia* 13: 205–218.
- Trenecsényi-Waldapfel, J. (1964): Calvus ex Nanneianis (di un luogo poco chiaro dell' Epistolario Ciceroniano), *Athenaeum* XVII: 42–51.
- Ward, A.M. (1973): Cicero's Fight against Crassus and Caesar in 65 and 63 B.C., *Historia* 22: 244–258.
- Wiseman, T.P. (1968): Two Friends of Clodius in Cicero's Letters, *CQ* 18: 297–315.
- Wiseman, T.P. (1987): *Catullus and his World*. Cambridge.
- Wiseman, T.P. (1994): The Senate and the Populares, 69–60 B.C., *CAH²*, vol. IX, Cambridge: 326–367.
- Yavetz, Z. (1963): The Failure of Cataline's Conspiracy, *Historia* 12: 485–499.

